

III. Remarks

Claims 1 and 4-27 were pending in this application and have been rejected. The present amendment amends claims 1, 4, 8 and 18 to more particularly point out and clarify Applicants' invention. No new matter has been added by the present amendment. After this amendment, claims 1 and 4-27 will be pending.

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Specification:

Paragraph [0003] has been amended to recite that "It is known" and "the risk of injury to the seat belt occupant". These amendments were in response to the objections that in line 2 of paragraph [0003], "know" should be "known", and in line 4 of paragraph [0003], "the" should precede "seat". Accordingly, Applicants believe that the amendments to paragraph [0003] have cured the respective objections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In view of the amendments and remarks contained herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 4 and 8 are traversed.

Claim 4 has been amended to recite that the seat-belt is associated with a retractor mechanism having a controllable force limiter which is adjustable to affect

the restraining force applied to the seat occupant. This amendment is supported at paragraphs [0013] and [0042]-[0043] and Figures 1 and 5. A detailed discussion of the controllable force limiter is also provided in paragraph [0043]. Moreover, PCT WO 00/76814, which was published on December 21, 2000 and corresponds to US Patent No. 6,616,081, discloses some alternative examples of a controllable force limiter contained in the prior art. Applicants believe that this amendment sufficiently clarifies “the controllable force limiter” to one of ordinary skill in the art and accordingly, believe that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 4 should be withdrawn.

Claim 8 has been amended to recite that the restraining system includes a controllable seat support for controllably resisting forward movement of the seat in response to the output signal. This amendment is supported at paragraphs [0017] and [0085], and Figure 5. Applicants believe that this amendment sufficiently clarifies the “controllable device” previously recited in claim 8 to enable one of ordinary skill in the art and accordingly, believe that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 4-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as the invention. In view of the amendments and remarks contained herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1 and 4-27 is traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that a safety arrangement incorporates a seat-belt to protect an occupant of a vehicle seat. The seat-belt is part of a

restraining system to restrain the occupant in a collision situation. This amendment was in response to the objection that the phrase "of the type" in claim 1, line 2, renders the claims indefinite. Therefore, Applicants believe that the amendment to claim 1 has cured the respective objection.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite that the second input signal is processed by being passed through an integrator. This amendment is supported at paragraphs [0074] and [0082], and was made in response to the objection that in claim 18, "low pass filter" was indefinite because the term "low" was not comparable to something. Therefore, Applicants believe that the amendment to claim 1 has cured the respective objection.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections of claims 1 and 4-27 should be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledges the Examiner would allow claim 1 and 4-12 if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as set forth in the Office Action.

Applicants have amended the claims to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections as set forth in the Office Action and accordingly, believe that claims 1 and 4-27 are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 10, 2009

/Daniel P. Dailey/

Daniel P. Dailey, Reg. No. 54,054
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
524 SOUTH MAIN STREET
SUITE 200
ANN ARBOR, MI 48104
(734) 302-6000